

MC CLAY'S PRESENT VIEWS ON DUELING.

Mr. Clay has been a duelist from his youth; and in his advanced years has been a counsellor of the very highest authority in all questions concerning the law of dueling. Still multitudes profess that he is a reformed duelist, that he has renounced dueling, and that he is entitled to the charity and forgiveness and honor, which ever attend a sincere and honorable repentance. To this claim we should be first in acquiescing, provided the facts were so. But of this we have ever found ourselves unable to discern the slightest evidence.

On the contrary, in his declaration against dueling in 1826, after having fought a duel with John Randolph, he still spoke of fighting as a thing which he might "by inevitable circumstances be forced to do," and argued that dueling "is an affair of feeling, about which we cannot though we should reason." A curious jumble of logic indeed, but the intended amount of it plainly was, that dueling was a sort of *fatality*, on account of which no accountability could be really attached to the duellist. If it does not mean this, it means nothing. And his subsequent conduct shows that this was his feeling, and that he still considered himself within the scope of the "laws of honor," and liable to be placed under that horrible "necessity" of suffering, or attempting or committing murder to avoid dishonor.

In the affair of Cilley's duel, where Mr. Clay was the chief counsellor of one party, and so guilty as accessory before the fact, we find him doing homage to the bloody code. And even so late as the year 1841, after he had himself voted for Mr. Adams's bill to suppress dueling in the district of Columbia, we find him deliberately charging a brother senator with language that was "FALSE AND COWARDLY"—and which he himself declared, "I INTENDED AS A DELIBERATE OFFENCE," which means, in the dialect of duellists, that he intended to drive the other senator to the "necessity" of challenging him to fight a duel. And the instant Dr. Linne came to him, Mr. Clay, without waiting to hear his message, says,—"You have a challenge, I ACCEPT IT." He was then of the age of 64. For this, they were both placed under bonds as duellists; and under bonds as a duellist Mr. Clay remains to this moment.

Still his friends are so loud and confident in averring that he is no longer a duellist, that a number of his "political admirers and friends," in the counties of Fayette and Westmoreland, Pennsylvania, belonging to the "Whig and Anti-Masonic parties," and anxious, if possible, to "swell his vote" at the election, yet perplexed by the flagrancy of these assertions, adopted the very rational mode of solving their doubts and settling their consciences by referring the question directly to Mr. Clay himself. Their letter bears date "West Newton, Pa., July 15, 1844."

The letter is too long for us to copy. The gentlemen refer to Mr. Clay's "well-known reputation for manly independence and frankness," and on it they trust that "he will avail himself of no technical objections or evasions." After a cogent scriptural argument to prove that "Divine Providence rules the destinies of nations as well as individuals," and that the people of the United States are "peculiar people, having peculiar duties to perform," they come plump to the question, and "respectfully ask Mr. Clay whether, if challenged to fight a duel, he would reject the invitation; and if so, from what considerations, temporal or eternal?"

They proceed to contrast the "law of honor" with the law of God, the law of true honor; and tell how they should rejoice, "not as mere politicians, but as Christians and fellow travellers with Mr. Clay to the bar of eternity, to be authorized by him on this occasion to record the weight of his testimony to the authenticity and supremacy of that honorable code; and thus, in his person, swell the triumphs of regenerate over fallen man."

They then urge sundry arguments to show to Mr. Clay how much true glory he could win for himself if he would "come straight up to the mark," with true courage and independence; confess his sin in the matter and declare his firm determination to do no more. And they allude to his course in the Cilley case, as most pertinent to the occasion, to illustrate the difference between true repentance and Mr. Clay's ostensible position; and show what Mr. Clay would have done in that case, if "uninumbered by the incubus of his code of honor."

His Christian friendship for Mr. Graves would have elicited some salutary admonition from Mr. Clay. In default of the efficacy of that, he would have taken upon him forthwith to inform the proper authorities of the meditated defilement. Thus the whole affair would have been quashed. Divine and human law would have been honored instead of being infringed. And in the respectable example of Mr. Clay, perhaps, the most efficient personal veto would have been exerted against a besetting sin of our land, which the United States could afford. But that occasion has passed by unimproved, and it only remains to be revealed, according as he shall now answer, whether he will still suffer his gray hairs to go down to the grave; the living, the dying, the accessory and practical patron and rotary of fashionable murder. Or whether, on the contrary, now, in the winter of life, as one end of the beam is fast receding from view, he shall yet think fit, for the benefit of surviving generations, to inscribe on the surviving end of it, in the language of the prophet, "Holiness to the Lord!"

They do "see!" To this letter, Mr. Clay replies as follows:

ASHLAND, August 1, 1844.

Gentlemen,—I duly received your letter of the 15th ultimo, on the subject of dueling; and I appreciate fully the friendly, and patriotic motives which prompted you to address it to me. Pernicious as the practice undoubtedly is, I hope you will excuse me when I say that there are other questions, in our public affairs, of

LIBERTY STANDARD.

"Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."—Leviticus, 25: 10.

VOL. IV.

HALLOWELL, MAINE, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1844.

NO. 5.

much higher and of more general importance. The victims, or votaries of that practice are but few in number, and bear no comparison with the immense number of sufferers from the rejection of wise measures of national policy, or the adoption of those of an opposite character.

I expressed, in strong terms of condemnation, my opinion against dueling in a letter which I addressed to my constituents, in March, 1824, which is to be found in the published collection of my speeches. Again, within a few years past, I gave evidence of my strong disapprobation of it, by voting, in the Senate of the United States, for the bill for suppressing dueling in the District of Columbia.

With these proofs of my sentiments, I think, gentlemen, you ought to be satisfied. But you ask me, whether, if I were challenged to fight a duel, I would reject the invitation? Considering my age, which is now past 67, I feel that I should expose myself to ridicule if I were to proclaim whether I would or would not fight a duel. It is certainly one of the most unlikely events that can possibly be imagined, and I cannot conceive a case in which I should be provoked or tempted to go to the field of combat. But, as I cannot foresee all the contingencies which may possibly arise, in the short remnant of my life, and for the reason which I have already stated, of avoiding any exposure of myself to ridicule, *I cannot reconcile it to my sense of propriety to make a declaration one way or the other.*

You have, gentlemen, done me some, but not full justice, in respect to the affair of the lamented Cilley. When I first obtained any knowledge of his difficulty with Mr. Graves, I did not think that there was the smallest occasion for a combat between them. I believed from the first, that the matter would be amicably accommodated; to that end all my exertions were directed. I did not know that it was not accommodated until the day when and after the parties went out to fight.—On that day I was confined to my room, by illness, and it was altogether accidental, that I obtained information that the parties had gone out. But I was neither informed as to the plan, or the hour of their meeting. Contrary to the impression which you entertain, I did advise the employment of the police to arrest the parties and prevent the duel. The constables accordingly went out in search of them, but like myself, being ignorant of the time and place of their meeting, they mistook their route, and failed in the accomplishment of their object. If you would read attentively the whole of my correspondence with Mr. Wise, to which you have referred, you will find that it sustains the preceding statement. I am gentleman,

With great respect,

Your friend and ob't servt

H. CLAY.

Messrs. Alex. Palmer, Wm. Campbell, Eli Cope, John Darr, Joseph Darr, B. Smith, Amie Smith, Eli H. McClelland, Robert Cunningham, Jas. Finley, John Boyd, M. P. Smith, William Brookens, and E. Newlon, &c. &c.

This letter is exactly on a level with Mr. Clay's Mendenhall speech—vulgar, tricky, evasive and unprincipled. He insults religious and conscientious men, his political admirers, by telling them that the bank and distribution and tariff matters are "of much higher and more general importance" than these "nine days' bubbles" about murder and the law of God.

He refers to his great age as a reason, for what? for affirming that he never can again attempt to take the life of another or intentionally peril his own, in a duel? not at all—but as an apology for refusing to answer their honest question, because answering it would make him appear RIDICULOUS! Ridiculous, indeed; can any thing be more ridiculous?

But examine his language; involved and craftily complicated as it is, and that whatever may be his age or however elevated his station, circumstances may yet occur, under which HE HOLDS HIMSELF READY AGAIN TO TAKE THE FIELD.

Yes, Christian men of the North, you may elevate him by your votes to the presidency, but you now do it with your eyes open, and in the face of his own declaration, that he is still as ready to give himself a challenge, as he was when he himself challenged Humphrey Marshall, in 1808, or when he accepted the challenge he had intentionally provoked from Mr. King in 1841. Elect Mr. Clay, and if he will not fight a duel before his term expires, you now know from himself that it will be owing not to his own principles, but to the forbearance of his enemies.—Chronicle.

Our printers have "followed copy" in Mr. Clay's letter. But we presume there are two misprints. The letter to his constituents was written in 1826, after the duel with Randolph. Mr. Clay doubtless wrote, in 4th paragraph of the letter,—"I was neither informed as to the place, &c."

HON. WILLIAM SLADE, the nominee for Governor in Vermont, addressed a letter to the Whig Mass Meeting in Sheldon, in which he says Henry Clay "does not wish to perpetuate slavery." But Mr. Clay himself says, for the planting States, he is opposed to emancipation, immediate or gradual. Put this and that together. Mr. Slade also says, the Whig party constitute the "True Liberty Party." But Mr. Clay says, "I rejoice that neither of the great political parties entertain any design to abolish slavery. I should exceedingly regret it, if they did." Horace Greeley, of the Tribune, the leading Whig organ, labors incessantly to wash the Whig party clear of what Mr. Slade charges them with. Now, why should Mr. Slade show

himself such a demagogue. He is a professed christian—Presbyterian. We pity such men.—[Albany Patriot.]

We commend the following excellent article, from the pen, doubtless, of Rev. Kiah Bailey, formerly of this state. Think of it.

From the Freeman.
PRAYING ONE WAY, AND VOTING ANOTHER.

Most Christians are in the habit of praying that God would give us good men for rulers, men that fear God and work righteousness. Their children and others hear them—think religion is a good thing, and believe that all Christians wish to have wise and godly men rule the nation, and be nursing fathers to the church. A general election comes round: the leaders of the political parties select a man, who will carry out their views, help them into office, and carry the largest number of votes; pledge themselves to support him, and call upon their party to give him their votes. What can the Christian now do? The nominee is notoriously ungodly—neither fears God nor regards man—has often lifted his hand to shed his neighbor's blood—lives by oppression, and robs his fellow men of their unalienable rights—has been a noted gambler, and lived in open violation of God's law. His character is well known—has been written with the point of a diamond, and laid in the rock forever. It is a matter of record, a portion of history, that cannot be erased. All the wasters of the Ohio, with soap and nitre, cannot wash him from his pollutions. These must and will remain to future generations, and go with him to the bar of his final Judge. All this the Christian, who has been praying for good rulers, well understands. But this ungodly man is the nominee of his political party, and he hopes, or tries to hope, that he will carry out the views of his party, and secure those *monied concerns*, about which they are contending.—Conscience remonstrates; but he forces himself, and votes for the man of oppression and blood. His children and family see that his conduct and his prayers are directly opposed to each other. He prays one way and acts the other. They see he is a hypocrite and soon conclude all his religion is outside show, and that those who make long prayers, can devour widows' houses for gain now, as well as in olden times. His neighbors also see his inconsistency, and in their hearts say he is a hypocrite—prays one way, and votes another. And those cunning leaders, who have seduced him to vote for their ungodly nominee, see his hypocrisy, and in their hearts despise him and his religion. There is also an Omnipotent God, who sees his hypocrisy, abhors his prayers, and will lead him forth with the workers of iniquity.—Such is the position, such the reward, which hypocritical Christians gain by praying one way, and voting the other. Come, let us look at a good deacon, who prays in his family in the morning, that God would give us good men to rule over us, men that fear God and work righteousness; men that are a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; he mounts his horse, goes to the polls, and votes for a cruel oppressor and bloody duelist. Let him stand up before men and angels, repeat his prayer and hand in his vote!—What think ye of such a man? Is he a follower of Jesus Christ, or of a different master? For shame! Let all such men, even if they occupy the sacred desk, either leave off praying or sinning. Better not pray, than act the hypocrite—pray one way, and vote the other.

Under the present apportionment, the North has a majority of 47 members in the House of Representatives, and an equal number of Senators with the South. The North can elect a President and Vice President. So that whatever acts the House of Representatives might enact, could be passed into laws by the action of the Senate and the President. The whole matter of slavery in the District and Florida, and of the Internal Slave Trade, is within the constitutional scope of Northern politics. It is but just that each citizen should be asked to do his portion of that which *ought to be done*, and which is within the reach of the aggregate political power of the non-slaveholding States. No one man can abolish slavery, but *all can*; and of the *all*, you form a necessary part, and ought to be found in your place, thus encouraging others. Listen to a statement of facts, showing how little above a state of vassalage Northern citizens are, yourself among the number.

Power should be wielded according to population, and the value of interests to be protected by the Government. In other words, the majority should rule; for, as a general thing, the interests of the majority are greater than the interests of a minority.

Now the North had, in 1840, of free population, 9,752,240 And the South had, of free population, 4,782,783 Difference, 4,969,452 To have had justice done her, the North should have had double the number of offices under the General Government which the South should have had—because her population, and her capital invested in domestic and foreign commerce, are double to those of the South. But look at the following table:

NORTH. SOUTH.

Presidents, 4 6

Secretaries of State, 4 10

“ War, 9 7

“ Navy, 8 6

“ Treasury, 11 4

Vice Presidents, 6 4

Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, 10 17

Attorney Generals, 5 12

Speakers of House of Reps., 9 20

Post Masters General, 7 4

73 90

Difference, 17

And again: No. of ministers sent to the European, Mexican and South American courts from the United States, 120

Of these the South has had 71 49

“ “ “ North, 22

22

Just. It is within the reach of the humblest man. It is to be found in the BALLOT BOX. Will you, discarding all prejudice, and dissolving all *old* political connections, by which you and others have kept the slave fettered and the North impoverished, apply the remedy in an honest heart, and thus bring back to the country prosperity and peace?

A TELLER OF THE TRUTH.
DON'T BE GULLED AGAIN.

Abolitionists cannot afford to be gulled more than once. They were gulled into the support of Garrison in 1840, on the ground that he was favorable to abolition. Passes were taken by the Whigs at the North to represent that he was a member of an Abolition Society in Virginia once, and that he, of course, must be hostile to slavery. But Gen. Garrison was very careful not to express an opinion in regard to any movement in which Northern and Southern Whigs did not agree. He managed the matter with so much shrewdness that nearly all the abolitionists voted for him. But how greatly were they disappointed. His election had hardly taken place when he went to Virginia and repudiated Abolition from the bottom of his soul. The Richmond Whig gave the following sketch of his remarks:

"He spoke some 20 minutes, with a clear and distinct voice, and in an animated strain. He referred to the great cardinal principles of his political creed, and then noticed a few of the numerous charges which had been made against him. He has been called an Abolitionist, he said. In one sense, as he has told his friends in Baltimore, he was an Abolitionist. He was in favor of emancipating the slaveholders, and restoring them to the rights of citizenship. He would absolve them from the thralldom under which they have been groaning for years. He would have them to speak and to act up to the dictates of their conscience, as he would have all others. He would break the bandages which bound them, and set them free. To this extent, and this extent only, was he an Abolitionist.

Fourth. Congress, in recognizing the right of the South to control the interests of the North, 1836-7, passed a law called the LOAN BILL, by which the surplus moneys, then amounting to forty millions of dollars, were to be *loaned* to the several States. The principle of division, instead of being based upon the numbers of free population, was based upon the ratio of Representation; and as each slave State had its slave population counted—each slave three-fifths as much as each freeman—in the number of its representative population, so each State by this law drew money in proportion to the representative power of its slaves. The effect of such a principle of division, was, to give the six states of S. Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Kentucky, the aggregate of whose free population was less than that of

Pennsylvania, the sum of \$6,754,588 while Pennsylvania had but 3,823,353, or to reduce it, the amount of money received by the non-slaveholding States when divided by their population, gave to each person about 18.8 cents, while the south received for each *free* person about 27 cents. Now, surely this is neither constitutional in spirit, nor just in practice—but it is the way Northern Congressmen and Northern voters submit to be governed.

Fifth. In 1840-1, Congress passed an act for the distribution of the moneys from the sales of the PUBLIC LANDS. This law divided the proceeds of the sales among the several States; but Congress, true to its habits of subserviency to the South, made the principle of representation the principle of division, instead of free population. The consequence is to New York, that of every three millions of dollars which the United States receives from said sales, the South cheats her out of \$43,721, her present portion for each three millions being \$456,636, whereas on a free basis it would have been \$500,857. This is not all. Bear in mind that the great source of revenue in this virtuous old Commonwealth, be an Abolitionist? How could a Virginian, whose sires received many distinguished tokens of confidence and esteem at the hands of this great nation, be an Abolitionist? How could a Virginian, whose ancestors, as to be an Abolitionist? Could such a Virginian be called an Abolitionist by another Virginian, and that other a true-hearted Virginian, and sound to the core? The thing was impossible. The bosom could not be free from taint that harbored such a suspicion.

He said he had not given pledges and promises before the election, because such a precedent was calculated to do mischief, and to confer the Presidency upon men of promise instead of men of performances.—But now that he was no more a candidate for the suffrages of the people, and could not be affected by their votes, he had no hesitation in declaring, what had ever been his feelings, his steadfast devotion to the rights and interests of his native State. In this connexion, he adverted to the heavy debt of gratitude which had been imposed upon him by the generous support which he had received from his adopted State, Ohio—the young giant, Indiana, and noble Kentucky, which had honored him with her citizenship, although he had never lived within her borders. But all this did not efface from his mind what was due to his revered mother.

He alluded to the report of Mr. Granger being an abolitionist. He said he had never been so foolish as to ask him whether he was an Abolitionist or not—knowing as he did, his public life and history. But Mr. Granger had come to him the day before he left Washington and told him that an article in a Richmond paper, which admitted the possibility of his being an abolitionist, had just fallen under his eye. He (Mr. G.) desired him (Mr. H.) when he got to Richmond to say to the editors of that paper, that he was not only no abolitionist, but he should expect Gen. H. to evict him from office should he ever become one."

Now don't be gulled again. Many of the friends of Mr. Clay presume to say, in arguing with abolitionists, that they have no doubt Mr. Clay, if elected, will use his influence in favor of abolition! Mr. Clay himself does not say so; indeed he has recently asserted that he still holds to the opinions expressed in his anti-abolition speech of 1839, in which he said that "two hundred years of legislation had sanctioned and sacrificed negro slaves as property." But his supporters at the north remember the old ruse of 1840. So let abolitionists be on their guard. Let them remember that Mr. Clay is still a slaveholder, and still insists that negro slavery is sanctified by the law of God. If they will continue to bear this in mind they will not be gulled again.

GREAT WHIG CONVENTION.

Twenty Thousand Whigs in Council!

We are indebted to our unknown friend Makerson of Athens, Ga., for the Northern Whig of the 10th inst. containing an account of the recent great Whig Convention. We copy several of the mottoes borne in the procession, for the amusement of our northern Whig friends, especially such as support Clay in order

"There is but one proper and effectual mode by which the abolition of slavery can be accomplished, and that is by the legislative authority; and this, so far as my belief goes, shall not be wanting.—George Washington."

THE LIBERTY TICKET.

NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT, A. D. 1844,

JAMES G. BIRNEY,

OF MICHIGAN,

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

THOMAS MORRIS,

OF OHIO,

FOR GOVERNOR,

JAMES APPLETON,

ELECTORS AT LARGE,

SAMUEL FESSENDEN,

DRUMMOND FARNSWORTH,

1st Dist.—HENRY HOBBS, Waterboro'.

2d Dist.—NATHANIEL PEASE, Bridgton.

3d Dist.—CHARLES MORSE,

4th Dist.—ZURY ROBINSON,

5th Dist.—LEONARD HATHAWAY,

7th Dist.—THOMAS D. SMITH.

Representatives to Congress.

1st Dist.—BURLEIGH SMART.

2d Dist.—SAMUEL FESSENDEN.

3d Dist.—SETH MAY.

4th Dist.—CHARLES C. CONE,

5th Dist.—DRUMMOND FARNSWORTH,

JAMES BOWEN, 28th Congress.

6th Dist.—ASA WALKER,

7th Dist.—SAMUEL M. POND.

SENATORS.

FIRST DISTRICT.

THEODORE WELLS,

GILBERT TARBOX,

NATHANIEL LORD.

SECOND DISTRICT.

SARGENT SHAW,

CHARLES WALKER,

ENOCH PRATT,

SAMUEL SMALL.

OXFORD DISTRICT.

JOHN PIKE,

GEORGE FRENCH,

IRA BARTLETT.

SOMERSET DISTRICT.

ELEAZER COUBURN,

STEPHEN WILLIAMSON.

LINCOLN DISTRICT.

JOHN BOYNTON,

PELEG WADSWORTH,

ROBERT MURRAY,

SAMUEL PICKARD.

PENOBSCOT DISTRICT.

EDWARD FAIRFIELD,

TIMOTHY GEORGE,

SAMUEL M. KNIGHTS.

HANCOCK DISTRICT.

STEPHEN WARDWELL,

EIGHTH DISTRICT.

PETER TALBOT.

FRANKLIN DISTRICT.

ELNATHAN POPE.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

JOSIAH FRENCH,

JOSEPH MERRILL,

WILLIAM E. FOLSCHE.

Franklin—CHRISTOPHER DYER,

HENRY HUNTER.

Lincoln—JOTHAM DONNELL,

Kennebec—JONATHAN GARLAND,

Cumberland—DANIEL HALL,

Oxford—GEORGE W. CHAPMAN,

Hancock—RUFUS TRUSSELL,

Washington—NATHANIEL LAMB,

Penobscot—JOSEPH C. SMALL.

COUNTY TREASURERS.

Lincoln—JOHN M. BAILEY,

York—TIMOTHY BRACKETT,

Cumberland—ZADOC HUMPHREY,

Oxford—ELISHA MORSE,

Somerset—WILLIAM B. MORRILL,

Hancock—NEWTON STOVER,

Washington—WILLIAM A. CROCKER,

Penobscot—WILLIAM H. DOW,

Franklin—PETER R. TUFFTS.

COUNTY ATTORNEYS.

Somerset—JUDAH MCLELLAN,

CLERKS OF COURTS.

Somerset—NATHAN WYMAN.

The Grand Conspiracy!

This is now developing some new aspects.

The slave power has for ten years sought the annexation of Texas, but it has not until the present year

resorted to the effects of partisanship, to bring the North to acquiesce. This last experiment is now

in operation. Through John C. Calhoun, it has

carried the democratic party in a body, silencing

entirely all effective opposition. The same power

has now undertaken to carry the Whig party

through Mr. Clay, the veteran compromiser. At

the time his first letter was written, the free States

demanded an attitude apparently adverse to the

scheme. Partisanship had not then blinded the eyes,

for its fires were not fully kindled; and had his

first letter been like the last, it would have de-

stroyed his prospects instantly. But now the party

has acquired such velocity as to render it safe to

be more bold, and Mr. Clay will carry it over to

annexation by revealing himself fully in its favor.

If northern whigs will support Mr. Clay where he

now is, that very fact will effectively disarm and

neutralize all effective opposition, and the work is

very likely it may.

Q that there were integrity enough in that party

now to maintain its integrity!—but that is not to

be expected. Mr. Clay will employ the extra-

gant idolatry of the party, towards himself, to car-

rying the whole body into the support of an open-

avowed annexationist, who probably tells the north

that their great argument against it, viz: the ben-

fit of slavery, shall have no weight whatever with

his administration. What a perfect veto upon the

great arguments of Seward, Kent, Childs, Choate,

Giddings, &c. Such is the power of the two

grand overseers, Calhoun and Clay, through the

power of party machinery. Let no anti-slavery

men be found in their ranks.

Pay no regard to stories against the Liberty

Party. There is the most stupendous system of

lying now pursued by our opponents, ever resor-

ted to on earth.

The Liberty Party in Maine will do its duty.

Fidelity and activity are every where seen. Slave

will die. It will be killed in the ballot-box.

Be careful about mixed ballots. Providence

has now so perfectly exposed the position of Mr.

Clay on Texas, as leave to no apology for voting

against the slave's rights on that account.

Record the testimony of your several held

where you will wish to find it a thousand years

hence.

Give us early information of the results of other

States.

Star, with this inscription, "Texas honorably acquired," reverse, twenty-six Stars, and WE TRUST IN GOD."

"Oglethorpe hath hearts and hands, and arms and hosts, to bring against oppression."

"Texas, come in at the gate, not over the wall."

"Texas with disunion, never!" Re-

verse, "Union nad Texas."

"Clay and Frelinghuysen." "TEX-

AS WITH NATIONAL HONOR."

Of course, these Southern Whigs under-

stand Mr. Clay to go against Texas!

Who can doubt it?—[Granite Freeman.

Correspondence.

For the Liberty Standard.

GOOD NEWS FROM NEW PORT-

LAND.

MR. WILLEY:

Notwithstanding we have taken great pains to distribute information in our town and vicinity, yet there are so many embracing the principles of the Liberty party and declaring their opposition and hostility to the two pro-slavery parties,—that we are constrained (from the demands of people) to send for four more Nos. of the Liberty Standard. This will supply every man who is not supplied with tracts or papers. There are now many of the whig lecturers about our vicinity, courting the favor of the abolitionists; justly reviving their opposition to the annexation of Texas—then preaching that they must vote for Mr. Clay in order to keep it out.

I have only to say that the good people of this country are not so easily humbugged. They have got an eye to the southern papers and southern interpretations of Clay's letters.

The Hon. Gentleman who is now lecturing about this district was sent for by the whigs of this town to speak on the annexation question and every measure was taken to toll out the abolitionists to hear, and, sir, out of about seventy-five abolitionists in this town they succeeded in getting out three, and I was one of them. The good friends may rely on us as thorough liberty men.

Respectfully yours,

P. P. ELDER.

New Portland, August 30, 1844.

For the Liberty Standard.

Hallowell, Sept. 2, 1844.

AUSTIN WILLEY, Esqr.

Dear Sir,—Permit me to inquire thro' the medium of your valuable journal, if some efficient measures cannot be taken to prevent the outrages that almost nightly take place in the streets of this town. It really does seem to me sir, that there may be men enough found in Hallowell who would act promptly in this matter.

Last Saturday night—or rather Sabbath morn—Front street was a scene of shouting—cursing—and obscene language—more resembling the 'Five Points' than that of a quiet New England town. I make these remarks merely to ascertain if there is not some remedy to be applied for this gross abuse. These suggestions are raised by the late outrage on Saturday night last on the 'Birney Flag staff.' The Halyards of the Flag staff were cut down, by some four of what would be called GENTLEMEN? of Hallowell amidst the most shocking and disgusting language that can be imagined to proceed from the lips of any one. A similar attempt was also made to pull down the sign of Mr. Elmes, the Hatter—and doubtless they would have succeeded—inasmuch as one of those GENTLEMEN? had commenced his attack upon Mr. Elmes's sign,—but for a window being raised by one of the neighbors who had been aroused from his slumber by the obscene language of these blackguards, the noise of which caused them speedily to decamp. It would be nothing strange, nor unexpected, to be awoken some night, and find our dwellings and stores set on fire. It was the intention of these rowdies to have set fire to the flag staff—and nothing prevented them from so doing, but a want of a bunch of matches. Surely, it is high time that the citizens of Hallowell constitute a night watch or adopt some other wholesome and sanitary measure to preserve the safety, peace and quiet of its inhabitants.

Yours respectfully,

A LOVER OF ORDER.

For the Liberty Standard.

North Dixmont, August 8, 1844.

BROTHER WILLEY:

I received on Saturday last under the frank of Hon. L. Severance, M. C. the 'Voice of the People' of July 18, 1844, and also a half sheet of the Kennebec Journal of April 5th, 1844, calling loudly upon the abolitionist to read and vote for Henry Clay at the next Presidential election. Precious old documents—for which I forwarded in return his papers and the following communication, which is at your disposal. Yours &c., J. N. RINES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE KEN-

NEBEC JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR:

Yours came to hand on Saturday last, which reminds me of the fable of the Fox and the Cock, the substance of which is as follows:—The Fox on walking abroad saw a Cock perched on a tree so high as to be completely beyond his reach, and wishing to make a meal of him said 'good morning Chanticleer,—have you heard the news?' 'what news?' returned the Cock.

'Astonishing,' says the Cock! doubting the truth of the story. 'It is,' rejoined the Fox, 'come down and let us shake hands.' 'I will come in a moment,' says the Cock, at the same time stretching up his neck and looking all around to see if there were not others coming to hear the news. 'What do you see?' inquired the Fox. 'Nothing but a pair of hounds,' replied the cock. 'I presume they are going to spread the

news of this late treaty of which you have been

Illinois Election.

The Liberty vote of this State grows better and better. The Fourth District has already returned 1826 Liberty votes, and the "Citizen" is confident of 1900

Last year, 1177

Increase, 733

This was far short of the expectation, and the same paper sets the mark for that District in the Presidential election at 4000?

SIXTH DISTRICT.

FOR CONGRESS.

John Cross. Last year,

43 33

51 00

123 45

141 98

FIFTH DISTRICT.

FOR CONGRESS.

Richard Eells. Last year,

159 137

64 43

94 50

In Will County the vote this year is 236, last year 150, which is 50 per cent gain.

KANE COUNTY.

Liberty vote for Congressmen for 1843 and '44.

1843 1844

12 21

45 55

21 43

37 33

1 6

28 43

1 1

7 5

19 33

12 24

175 284

DE KALB COUNTY.

Below is the official canvass of De Kalb Co.

LIBERTY TICKET.

For Congress.—John H. Henderson,

151

For Representatives.—King,

146

" " Manzer,

146

" " Dow,

227

For Sheriff.—Rose,

242

For County Com.—Woolsey,

224

For Coronor.—Potter,

206

For Com. Clerk.—Josselyn,

188

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

For Congress.—Wentworth,

273

For Representative.—Loop,

241

" " Jackson,

267

" " Jewell,

206

For Sheriff.—Walradt,

262

For Co. Com.—Hayden,

242

For Coronor.—Brooks,

225

For Com. Clerk.—Beavers,

254

WHIG TICKET.

For Congress.—Morris,

89

For Representative.—Smith,

86

" " Deitz,

80

The votes are not all in, but enough are received to show the noble advance of Liberty principles in that State. The gain is very large.

Gov. Kent's Speech.

The people of Hallowell had an opportunity last week to listen to a political argument by this gentleman. The question at issue between whigs and democrats, on the tariff, as he stated it, we will leave for them to adjust between themselves; but we deem proper a notice of his remarks on Texas.

Mr. Kent was introduced by Hon. J. Otis as merely a soldier—as one of the people—not as a candidate for office; and Mr. K. endeavored to impress the minds of his audience by this evidence of his disinterestedness. Had the people known that he is as really a candidate for the J. S. Senate as if his name was before the people for that office, it might have diminished the force of this introduction.

He said Texas was sought for the benefit of slavery, and that the whig party were pledged against it at any rate as a slave territory. He said Mr. Clay was opposed to annexation while a considerable portion of the people of the confederacy objected to it.

It was surprising that this gentleman should have said that the whig party was pledged against annexation. It is not true, and he ought to have known it. The southern Whigs are as much in favor of annexation, as the Democrats, and look to Mr. Clay to effect it. The party as such, holds no common position on the subject. Some are on one side, some on the other, and Mr. Clay is claimed by both. Neither is this party opposed to annexation except on condition of abolition. In some quarters that position has been taken, in others Texas is sought for the benefit of slavery; and both divisions are "good whigs." The party here in Maine is exulting over the election of an "immediate annexationist" as Governor of North Carolina. In the south annexation is a whig doctrine; in the north the opposite is whig doctrine.

ONE THING SETTLED.

In order to frighten liberty men from their integrity the whigs have represented that the annexation of Texas would certainly make slavery perpetual, and that abolitionists might then abandon all their efforts as wholly useless, etc. etc.

Mr. Coburn says he rode with me 'from Waterville home' during the political campaign of 1840.' The story in the Journal was—from Hallowell to Bloomfield last winter.' Here is a very material discrepancy. Whose correction this was does not appear. We have carefully looked over our papers of that period, corresponded with friends with whom we always stop at Bloomfield, and have arrived to a satisfactory certainty that we did not travel in the stage to Bloomfield, during that period.

We shall, as heretofore, oppose the annexation of Texas by all the powers we possess, as base scheme intended and calculated to sustain slavery, and seriously impair the Union of these states; but we shall do it on the ground of truth and reason, not by false alarms. If in spite of all our efforts Texas is annexed, the Liberty Party will be more necessary, if possible, than now. If the plot is defeated a great triumph will be gained, and this party will urge forward its glorious objects with the prospect of speedy success. This is our position.

WHO IS OPPOSED TO ANNEXATION?

Mr. Clay has now distinctly declared to the county and the world that he should be glad to see Texas annexed, and that the influence of annexation or slavery shall have no consideration with him; that it is a great and paramount national benefit; and should slavery be promoted by it, as that will probably at some remote period come to an end, it should be no obstacle to annexation. Here is his position.

Whichever, therefore, votes for him after this, says to him in the most emphatic manner, "GO ON." There is no avoiding this result. The democrat for the sake of party success abandoned former declarations, and mortgaged themselves and soul and body, to the slave power for four years more. Now the crisis comes with the whigs.—If they support Mr. Clay they will prove themselves equally evil, and they will be if possible more inconsistent than the democrats, for they have said much more on the subject.

But in view of Mr. Clay's last letter, Mr. Kent is bound in honesty and in honor to tell the people that he can ask support for Mr. Clay on this ground no longer, for he has now declared that the grand reason why the whigs have asked support for him in Maine, shall be allowed no consideration whatever. THE EFFECTS OF ANNEXATION ON SLAVERY SHALL NOT BE TAKEN INTO THE ACCOUNT.

To continue his support of Mr. Clay this speech, must sacrifice any man's public integrity. It is impossible to avoid it.

Mr. Kent said some abolitionists wished to annex Texas as a means of removing slavery.—There is not such an abolitionist in the country, so far as we have ever heard.

He quoted the wicked forgery of certain whig papers, representing us to have said that the Liberty Party is not opposed to annexation, and dwell upon it with some warmth. After the address we explained to him the fraud. He said he saw only what was quoted in the whig papers.

He dwelt upon the allegation that voting for Mr. Birney was voting for Polk. "The law of winter," said he "compels you thus to vote.—You cannot help it." We could not well repress a feeling of indignation at such a sentiment. Are the free people of Maine to be robbed of their right of suffrage by this miserable sophistry? Does the majority law, which obtains in this state in many other cases, and which has ever existed, we believe, in the old whig state of Massachusetts, destroy in fact the freedom of elections? Does it compel the people to vote for whom politicians tell them to vote? Are they chargeable with the election of the man they vote against?

Nothing is necessary to show the demagogues of this charge of voting for Polk if we vote for Birney, but to refer to 1840. Then the cry was equally loud and long that every liberty vote was a vote for Van Buren. It was *certainly* so—

we could not help it if we would. Upon abolitionists was charged all the responsibility of re-electing Van Buren, and we were well nigh mobbed for not yielding to this charge. Then the plurality law existed. The difficulty therefore is not the law of '43, but there is a determination to control in this way the ballots of the people and drive them into the support of the whig party.—

The people must veto this insidious attempt upon their highest, dearest right, or it will soon be lost.

But Mr. K. said respecting voting for a slaveholder, "YOU HAVE GOT TO VOTE FOR ONE." "YOU CANNOT HELP IT."

We ask the people of Hallowell to say at the polls whether they, freemen of Maine, the sovereigns of the nation are to be told by any man that they are OBLIGED TO VOTE FOR A SLAVEHOLDER.

Are we to be told that because whigs and democrats have set up their overseers,

the slaveholders, for office, therefore the people are obliged to vote for them? and if they do not

vote for one they shall be charged with the election of the other?

We hope the people of Maine are not mere serfs, mere incidents to politicians.—

Will they for partisan purposes endorse this death-warrant of their republicanism?

He took the position that it is morally right to vote for slaveholders—and to vote for Mr. Clay. Then it is morally right to vote for any man living, and there is really no moral law touching the qualifications of rulers, not subject to the exigencies of party warfare. Such doctrine is bad—very bad. It is surely time the moral sentiments of the people were awakened, not put to sleep over this subject. THERE IS MORAL LAW THERE. The Bible forbids electing slaveholders to rule this nation.

They do not answer the divine description of rulers. "He that ruleth over men must be just."

"When the wicked bear rule the people mourn."

Mr. Kent attempted to make it appear that voting for Mr. Clay was not voting for slavery, for we do not vote for the man, but for certain great measures. If this is correct, then we may vote for any knave or blackleg, if he will only carry out our great whig measures. Besides, who does not know that Mr. Clay is not only a slaveholder, but identified with the slave power, and if elected will employ the government for the benefit of slavery?

What then is Mr. Kent's argument worth? He must have thought his hearers 'particularly green.'

He sought to secure the confidence of abolitionists because he said something against slavery several years ago. How much proslavery action will that amount for? He attempted to maintain the groundless assumption, that the constitution requires us to vote for slaveholders. What an argument! Is any thing more absurd than that the constitution binds the people to elect those to administer it who will pervert its objects and trample its principles in the dust!

He thought abolitionists a good sort of people, but their leaders he would not vouch for. This was small business. Abolitionists have treated him with entire respect, and they made him Governor in 1840; and our own recommendation of him at that time may have contributed to that result. The most influential abolitionists in Maine are second to no other class of citizens—Mr. Kent not excepted.

But the whole argument respecting Texas was based on false premises, therefore the conclusions are of no importance. Those who vote for Henry Clay, vote for Texas, for slavery, for dueling, and other immorality—vote against the law of God and the rights of man.

He wished to see the thing done, and should it promote slavery, that shall be no objection to him in seeking it, should he be elected.

Abolitionists! Will you give your vote for an open Annexationist?

Whigs! Will you demonstrate the perfect insincerity of your former professions, by voting for an avowed ANEXATIONIST?

He is an avowal sufficiently distinct that if elected he will seek the Annexation of Texas and obtain it if he can without war or dissolution. If the slaveholders will call loudly for it and threaten to dissolve the Union, then he is pledged to go for it as a compromise, as he did in the admission of Missouri. His second letter declared that by opposition to a 'respectable portion of the confederacy' as constituting an objection, he meant 'States' and not individuals. Nothing therefore remains but to adjust the matter with Mexico, which probably may be done, and ANNEXATION IS CARRIED. Its effects on slavery he says shall not come into the account. HE WILL BE GLAD TO SEE IT DONE.

IRREFRAGABLE TESTIMONY.

After we published our communication on this subject addressed to the Kennebec Journal, we received from Mr. Abner Coburn of Bloomfield, a letter testifying in part to the allegations of that paper. But we considered the Journal the proper place for the article and therefore did not publish it.

Mr. Coburn says he rode with me 'from Waterville home' during the political campaign of 1840.' The story in the Journal was—from Hallowell to Bloomfield last winter.' Here is a very material discrepancy. Whose correction this was does not appear. We have carefully looked over our papers of that period, corresponded with friends with whom we always stop at Bloomfield, and have arrived to a satisfactory certainty that we did not travel in the stage to Bloomfield, during that period.

We shall, as heretofore, oppose the annexation of Texas by all the powers we possess, as base scheme intended and calculated to sustain slavery, and seriously impair the Union of these states; but we shall do it on the ground of truth and reason, not by false alarms. If in spite of all our efforts Texas is annexed, the Liberty Party will be more necessary, if possible, than now. If the plot is defeated a great triumph will be gained, and this party will urge forward its glorious objects with the prospect of speedy success. This is our position.

WE DON'T SO MUCH OBJECT TO THE THING ITSELF, as to the MAN and the PARTY by which it is to be accomplished."

A very large proportion of the hostility to Texy as Whigs, is mere hostility to John Tyler, as is demonstrable from the fact of their supporting an avowed annexationist for President.

The Convention at Mt. Vernon was one of great interest. True hearts were there.

A gentleman writes that the cause is prospering finely in Camden.

TEXAS! TEXAS! HEAR MR. CLAY'S ORGAN.

On the 25th of July last, just before the Kentucky election, there was issued from the office of the Louisville Journal an extra number of that paper, which was largely circulated over the State, containing a speech of Humphrey Marshall, the friend of Mr. Clay, and who is already spoken of as a member of his cabinet, in case of his election.

As a friend to Texas—as an American citizen, having no farther interest in the question of annexation than a sincere desire to promote the welfare of the people of both countries—as one who acknowledges the justness of the Texas revolution—the full and perfect sovereignty of Texas so far as she was originally acknowledged by the Constitution of the Mexican United States, and as one who would really desire to see her single star added

to the emblem of our own liberty, I am free to declare that I regard annexation as more certain, speedy, sure, on just and honorable terms, under the auspices of Mr. Clay, than under the guidance of his miserable competitor."

[Spirit of Liberty.]

to the emblem of our own liberty, I am free to declare that I regard annexation as more certain, speedy, sure, on just and honorable terms, under the auspices of Mr. Clay, than under the guidance of his miserable competitor."

[Spirit of Liberty.]

to the emblem of our own liberty, I am free to declare that I regard annexation as more certain, speedy, sure, on just and honorable terms, under the auspices of Mr. Clay, than under the guidance of his miserable competitor."</p

